

**REMARKS**

**Status of the Application**

Claims 1-16 are the claims that have been examined in the application. Claims 1, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoguchi in view of Taniguchi. Claims 2-6, and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoguchi and Taniguchi in view of Hasegawa. Claims 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoguchi and Taniguchi in view of Sonehara.

**Arguments against Rejections**

*Claims 1, 7 and 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoguchi in view of Taniguchi.*

Claim 1 recites, in part, “an optical transmission unit disposed between said first display unit and said second display unit, to transmit light, which is emitted from portions of said first screen, to respective portions of said second screen.” The Examiner alleges that a combination of Inoguchi and Taniguchi discloses all of the elements of claim 1 and renders claim 1 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner admits that Inoguchi does not specifically disclose an optical transmission unit disposed between the first display unit and the second display unit, to transmit light, which is emitted from portions of the first screen, to respective portions of the second screen (see the Office Action, page 3, lines 6-8). However, the Examiner argues that Taniguchi discloses the optical transmission unit recited in claim 1 (see the Office Action, page 3, lines 9-15).

Applicants respectfully submit that Taniguchi fails to disclose the optical transmission unit recited in claim 1. Taniguchi uses variable spacers 33, which control the distance between

two display units, i.e., the interval D between the display 1 and the spatial light modulation element 2 (see column 18, lines 29-32). However, open space exists between the two display units in Taniguchi's apparatus, with the result that Taniguchi fails to disclose a structure in which light is emitted from portions of the first screen to respective portions of the second screen as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the open space resulting from the variable spacers as disclosed in Taniguchi causes in variation in a line of sight of an observer, which in turn causes instantaneous deviation in overlap of an image in respective corresponding pixels.

To the contrary, the optical transmission unit recited in claim 1 is disposed between the first display unit and the second display unit, to transmit light, which is emitted from portions of the first screen, to respective portions of the second screen, thus permitting an accurate incidence of light emitted from pixels of the first display unit relative to the corresponding pixels of the second display unit.

As is clear from the foregoing, Taniguchi fails to disclose the optical transmission unit recited in claim 1, and when combined with Inoguchi, further fails to render claim 1 obvious over the applied art. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the applied art.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1, and are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

*Claims 2-6, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoguchi and Taniguchi in view of Hasegawa.*

Claims 2-6 and 14-16 depend from claim 1. Because the Examiner's proposed combination of Inoguchi and Taniguchi fail to disclose all of the elements of claim 1, and because Hasegawa fails to cure the deficiency noted in the Examiner's proposed combination

with respect to claim 1, claims 2-6 and 14-16 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Further, claim 2 is patentable for reasons independent of its dependency. Claim 2 recites, in part, “a first luminescent layer formed on said first substrate, said first luminescent layer emitting light so as to provide said first screen” and “a second luminescent layer formed on said second substrate, said second luminescent layer emitting light so as to provide said second screen.” Hasegawa discloses using an organic electro-luminescence (EL) panel as a backlight of an LCD or a light source for colors of red, green and blue. The liquid crystal panels are utilized as shutters for light emitted by EL elements. Thus, the LCD panel is not a light emitting panel and only the organic EL panel is a light emitting panel. Therefore, Hasegawa fails to disclose a first *and second* luminescent layer emitting light, as recited in claim 2.

Therefore, claim 2 is patentable over the applied art.

Additionally, claims 3 and 4 clearly indicate a position of the optical transmission unit, and are patentable for reasons independent of their dependency.

Claim 3 recites the optical transmission unit being disposed between the first display unit and an opposite surface of the second substrate to the second luminescent layer. Claim 4 recites the optical transmission unit being disposed between the second display unit and an opposite surface of the first substrate to the first luminescent layer. Hasegawa neither discloses nor suggests such specific positional relationships recited in Claims 3 and 4 of the present application. Therefore, claims 3 and 4 are patentable over the applied art.

With regard to claims 5 and 6, Taniguchi teaches using the same refractive index for two LCD panels. However, these two panels are not connected to each other through a specific optical transmission unit as recited in claim 1 of the present application, but two panels face each other so as to provide open space between them and a linear Fresnel lens is placed in the open space. Therefore, Taniguchi fails to disclose that the optical transmission unit has a same refractive index as either the first or second substrates as claimed in claims 5 and 6, respectively. Therefore, claims 5 and 6 are patentable over the applied art.

*Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoguchi and Taniguchi in view of Sonehara.*

Claims 9-13 depend from claim 1. Because the Examiner's proposed combination of Inoguchi and Taniguchi fail to disclose all of the elements of claim 1, and because Sonehara fails to cure the deficiency noted in the Examiner's proposed combination with respect to claim 1, claims 9-13 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No.: 10/762,509

Attorney Docket No.: Q79539

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dion R. Ferguson/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Dion R. Ferguson  
Registration No. 59,561

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 28, 2008